



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,479	10/17/2005	Mi Yeon Kim	P2958US00	8900
58/027	7/5/00	03/04/2011		
H.C. PARK & ASSOCIATES, PLC 8500 LEESBURG PIKE SUITE 7500 VIENNA, VA 22182			EXAMINER PORTER, WILLIAM ERNEST	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/04/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@PARK-LAW.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,479

Applicant(s)

KIM, MI YEON

Examiner

WILLIAM PORTER

Art Unit

3623

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-942)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/09, 7/6/09, 12/22/08, 10/17/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

The following is a **FINAL** office action. In accordance with the amendment to application 10/553,479 filed on 14 December 2010, claims 1-34 are pending in the application and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

- Claims 1-9, 12 and 14-33 have been previously amended.
- Claim 34 has been added new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-24, 26, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Daniel K. Gardner, Clinton A. Staley and Matthew A. Wormley, USPAT 6,064,978, (hereinafter referred to as Gardner et al).

Claim 1 –

As per claim 1, Gardner et al disclose a method that utilizes a processor (“computer network” is processor, col. 2, l. 54) to provide answers to a question, comprising:

- receiving a question from a first user; (col. 3, ll. 8-9)
- providing the question on a given web page; (col. 3, ll. 57—58)
- receiving evaluation data (“comments”, col. 3, ll. 21-22, and “question points” are evaluation data, col. 3, ll. 11-13) for the question from a second user and an operator of the

web page; ("answerers provides an answer ... via the computer network" is an operator of the webpage, col. 1, ll. 51-56; Fig. 7, col. 5, ll. 1-4)

- calculating evaluation result data, using the processor ("via the computer network", col. 2, l. 63), by reflecting the evaluation data; ("question points", col. 3, ll. 11-13, and "comments" are evaluation data, col. 3, ll. 21-22) and
- providing the evaluation result data on the web page in association with the question. (col. 3, ll. 57-60)

Claim 3 -

As per claim 3, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising displaying the question according to a predetermined display method if the evaluation result data is not coincident with a predetermined reference. (col. 3, ll. 57-60)

Claim 4 -

As per claim 4, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein:

- step (c) comprises receiving one of "affirmation" and "negation" for the question from the second user ("answerers" are second users, col. 3, ll. 22-27) or the operator, and step (d) comprises:
- increasing given evaluation value data corresponding to the evaluation result data if the "affirmation" is received; and reducing the evaluation value data if the "negation" is received. (col. 4, ll. 23-24)

Claim 6 -

As per claim 6, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising increasing point data associated with the second user by a predetermined value in response to the input of the evaluation data. (col. 3, ll. 49-40)

Claim 7 –

As per claim 7, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 6, wherein increasing the point data by the predetermined value comprises:

- receiving a limit number corresponding to a predetermined unit period from the operator (“points per day” determines unit period, col. 4, ll. 17-19);
- counting an input number that the second user inputs the evaluation data during the unit period; (“number of points per day”, col. 4, ll. 17-19) and
- if the input number is below the limit number, increasing the point data associated with the Second user by the predetermined value in response to the input of the evaluation data. (col. 3, ll. 49-40)

Claim 8 –

As per claim 8, Gardner et al disclose a method that utilizes a processor (“computer network” is processor, col. 2, l. 54) to provide answers to a question, comprising:

- providing a question input by a first user on a given web page; (col. 3, ll. 8-9)
- receiving an answer for the question from a second user; (col. 3, ll. 21-27)
- providing the answer on the web page in association with the question; (col. 4, ll. 7-8)
- if a plurality of answers are input, receiving votes for the answers from a third user (“answer evaluation system” is third user, col. 1, ll. 61-65) for a predetermined voting period (“asker A determines if any more comments are needed to complete the answer” is the voting period, col. 3, ll. 40-45); and increasing polling score, using the processor (“via the computer network”, col. 2, l. 63), corresponding to the answers in response to the input of the votes. (“numerical score” is polling score, col. 3, ll. 34-36)

Claim 9 -

As per claim 9, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, further comprising providing the polling score on the web page in association with the answers. ("a WWW page a question list with corresponding question point values", Fig. 2, col. 3, ll57-60)

Claim 10 -

As per claim 10, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the voting period is a predetermined period input by the first user and/or a period until the number of voters input by the first user is reached. ("answerers" are voters, col. 3, ll. 40-45)

Claim 11 -

As per claim 11, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the voting period is a predetermined period input by an operator and/or a period until a given number of voters input by the operator is reached. ("answerers" are voters, col. 3, ll. 40-45)

Claim 12 -

As per claim 12, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein receiving the answer comprises receiving answers to the question from the second user for a predetermined answer period, and the step of receiving the votes comprises receiving the votes for the answers from the third user if the answer period has elapsed. ("answerers" are voters, col. 3, ll. 40-45)

Claim 13 -

As per claim 13, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 12, wherein the answer period is a predetermined period input by the first user. ("assigning question points based on urgency", col. 1, ll. 50-54)

Claim 14 -

As per claim 14, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, further comprising adopting one or more answers based on the polling score if the voting period has elapsed. (col. 3, ll. 46-50)

Claim 15 -

As per claim 15, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein if the polling score corresponding to the answers is less than predetermined polling score after the voting period has elapsed, not adopting an answer and displaying that there is no adopted answer. (no answer being displayed after a question means no adopted answer, col. 4, ll. 7-8)

Claim 16 -

As per claim 16, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 14, further comprising displaying the adopted answer according to a predetermined display method. (col. 4, ll. 7-8)

Claim 17 -

As per claim 17, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 14, further comprising: deciding the second user who input the adopted answer as an answer adopter; ("selected for separate WWW site" is answer adopter, col. 4, ll. 64-67) and increasing point data associated

with the answer adopter by a predetermined value. ("answer points" is point data associated, col. 4, ll. 57-60)

Claim 18 -

As per claim 18, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 17, wherein increasing the point data associated with the answer adopter by the predetermined value comprises:

- maintaining point data associated with a user in a point database; (col. 4, ll. 60-62)
- receiving compensation point data from the first user; (col. 4, ll. 64-67)
- increasing the point data associated with the answer adopter by the compensation point data based on the compensation point data; (col. 4, ll. 64-67) and
- reducing the point data associated with the first user by the compensation point data. (col. 3, ll. 54-55)

Claim 19 -

As per claim 19, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 18, wherein increasing the point data associated with the answer adopter by the compensation point data based on the compensation point data comprises:

- if plural answers are adopted, distributing the compensation point data input by the first user in the ratio of the polling score corresponding to each of the adopted answers; (col. 3, ll. 51-53) and
- increasing the point data associated with each answer adopter by the distributed compensation point data. (col. 4, ll. 64-67)

Claim 20 -

As per claim 20, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, further comprising increasing the point data associated with the third user by a predetermined value in response to the input of the votes. (“free premiums” are increased point data, col. 4, ll. 62-64)

Claim 21 -

As per claim 21, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 20, wherein increasing point data by a predetermined value comprises:

- receiving a limit number corresponding to a predetermined unit period from an operator; (“question points per day”, col. 4, ll. 17-19)
- counting an input number that the third user inputs votes for the unit period; (“number of points per day”, col. 4, ll. 17-19) and
- if the input number is below the limit number, increasing the point data associated with the third user by the predetermined value in response to the input of the votes. (col. 3, ll. 39-40)

Claim 22 -

As per claim 22, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein receiving the votes comprises: receiving a vote return command for the answers from the first user; and receiving votes for the answers from the third user after the vote return command is input. (“answerers” are voters, col. 3, ll. 40-45)

Claim 23 –

Claim 23 is directed to a method for providing answers for a question. Claim 23 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above for claim 8. Claim 23 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above for claim 8, respectively.

Claim 24 –

As per claim 24, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 23, wherein receiving the evaluation data comprises receiving one of the given number of evaluation grades for the adopted answer from the first user, and increasing the point data comprises:

- maintaining a point data value corresponding to the evaluation grade; (col. 3, ll. 34-37) and
- increasing the point data associated with the second user by the point data value corresponding to the evaluation grade. (col. 3, ll. 46-50)

Claim 26 -

As per claim 26, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 25, wherein receiving the additional answer comprises:

- counting the number of additional answers input; and allowing the additional answers not to be input if the number exceeds a given number. (“determine if more comments (i.e., answers) are needed”, col. 3, ll. 41-46)

Claim 29 -

As per claim 29, Gardner et al disclose a method that utilizes a processor (“computer network” is processor, col. 2, l. 54) to provide answers to a question, comprising:

- providing a question input by a first user on a given web page; (col. 3, ll. 8-9)

- receiving answers for the question from a second user for a predetermined period; (col. 3, ll. 21-27)
- providing the answers on a web page in association with the question; (col. 4, ll. 7-8)
- deciding using the processor (“via the computer network”, col. 2, l. 63) the question and an answer associated with the question as knowledge data;

 (“formal recognition” is knowledge data, col. 5, ll. 1-5)
- receiving a recommendation for the knowledge data from a third user; (“formal recognition” is knowledge data, col. 5, ll. 1-5) and
- providing the recommendation on the web page in association with the knowledge data. (“formal recognition” is knowledge data, col. 5, ll. 1-5)

Claim 30 -

As per claim 30, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 29, further comprising displaying the recommended knowledge data according to a predetermined display method. (“WWW page acknowledgement”, col. 5, ll. 3-5)

Claim 34 –

As per claim 34, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the first user (“asker” is first user, col. 1, ll. 49-50), the second user (“an answerer” is second user, col. 1, ll. 55-56), and the third user (“answer evaluation system” is third user, col. 1, ll. 61-65) are all different users. Since the “asker” accepts or rejects the answer from the “answerer” (col. 1, ll. 58-59) the “asker” is different from the “answerer”. And, the third user (i.e., “answer evaluation system”) being a system is different.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 25, 27, 28, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al, and further in view of James D. Marks, Robert Weaver, and Jeremy Shao, USPGPUB 2003/0163356, (hereinafter referred to as Marks et al).

Claim 2 -

As per claim 2, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 1. Gardner et al teach providing answer for question and do not explicitly teach graphs. However, Marks et al teach wherein step (e) comprises displaying the evaluation result data as a predetermined graph. ("pictures" are graphs, pg. 1, Paragraph 0004, ll. 7-8 of Marks et al)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include graphs. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Claim 5 -

As per claim 5, Gardner et al in view of Marks et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 1. Gardner et al teach providing question and answer and do not explicitly teach operator action.

Gardner et al teach wherein step (d) comprises:

- calculating the evaluation result data by assigning a predetermined weight to the evaluation data that is received from the operator or the user to which predetermined authority ° has been assigned by the operator. (col. 2, ll. 1-6)

However, Mark et al teach the step

- wherein determining whether the received evaluation data is evaluation data that is received from the operator or a user to which predetermined authority has been assigned by the operator; (pg. 3, Paragraph 0047, ll. 3-4 & 8 of Marks et al).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include operator actions. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Claim 25 -

As per claim 25, Gardner et al in view of Marks et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 14 or 23. Gardner et al teach additional answers and does not explicitly teach having a problem raised. Gardner et al teach receiving an additional answer for the raised problem from the second user who input the adopted answer; and providing the additional answer on the web page in association with the adopted answer ("accepted answers" are additional answers, col. 4, ll. 7-8). However, Marks et al teach further comprising receiving a problem raised for the adopted answer by a fourth user; providing the raised problem to the second user who input the adopted answer. (pg. 3, Paragraph 0044, ll. 3-9)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include receiving a problem raised in the adopted answer. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of

Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Claim 27 –

Claim 27 is directed to a method for providing answers for a question. Claim 27 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above for claim 25. Claim 27 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above for claim 25, respectively.

Claim 28 –

Claim 28 is directed to a method for providing answers for a question. Claim 28 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above for claim 25. Claim 28 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above for claim 25, respectively.

Claim 31 -

As per claim 31, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 29. Gardner does not explicitly teach categories. However, Marks et al teach wherein:

- step (e) comprises receiving a category associated with the knowledge data from the third user, (pg. 2, Paragraph 0033, ll. 11-12 of Marks et al) and
- step (f) comprises displaying the category in association with the knowledge data. (pg. 4, Paragraph 0053 of Marks et al)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include receiving and displaying categories. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Claim 32 -

As per claim 32, Gardner et al disclose the method as claimed in claim 29. Gardner et al teach weights and do not explicitly teach knowledge database. However, Marks et al teach further comprising:

- maintaining the knowledge data and recommendation information associated with the knowledge data in a knowledge database; (“archive data”, pg. 2, Paragraph 0028, ll. 4-6, and “stores questions and answers”, pg. 2, Paragraph 0029, ll. 7-11 of Marks et al)
- receiving a search request for the knowledge data from a fourth user; (“select a question”, pg. 2, Paragraph 0033, l. 11 of Marks et al)
- searching the knowledge database for the knowledge data in response to the search request; (pg. 2, Paragraph 0033, ll. 14-16 of Marks et al)
- determining an arranging order of the searched knowledge data; (“categories by subject matter”, pg. 2, Paragraph 0028, ll. 5-6 of Marks et al) and
- displaying the searched knowledge data according to the arranging order, (pg. 2, Paragraph 0033, ll. 16-17 of Marks et al)
- the step of determining the arranging order of the searched knowledge data comprises the steps of:
 - determining whether the searched knowledge data are recommended knowledge data based on the recommendation information; (pg. 3, Paragraph 0042, ll. 15-25 of Marks et al)and
 - determining the arranging order by assigning a predetermined weight to the recommended knowledge data. (“question points” are weights, col. 2, ll. 1-7 of Gardner)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include knowledge data. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Claim 33 -

As per claim 33, Gardner et al in view of Marks et al disclose a method. Gardner et al teach a method and do not explicitly teach a computer-readable medium. However, Marks et al teach computer-readable recording medium ("method executed by a server", pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 1-2 of Marks et al) in which a program for implementing a method according to claim 1 is recorded.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Gardner et al to include computer-readable medium. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to be easily modifiable (pg. 1, Paragraph 0001, ll. 3-4 of Marks et al) and to expand the method of Gardner et al in this way since Marks et al discusses a method where the question is posted in a location where it is accessible to the experts to respond (pg. 1, Paragraph 0005, ll. 10-11 of Marks et al)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Office Action's analysis is flawed because it is inconsistent with disclosing "comments" then "question points" separately and distinctly as evaluation data. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments and responds that "comments"

and “question points” taken together are evaluation data. This change has been incorporated in the office action disclosure for claim 1, above.

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the computer network of prior art Gardner et al is used only to provide answers to published questions and not to calculate evaluation result data. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that in Gardner et al the expression “via the computer network” (col.2, ll. 60-63) is not limited to publishing questions. The phrase applies to and modifies the execution of the “answer evaluation method”. Accordingly, “via the computer network” implements the answer evaluation method and calculates evaluation result data.

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose receiving votes for the answers from a third user for a predetermined voting period. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that Gardner et al disclose this limitation in claim 8, above, and copied as follows. If a plurality of answers are input, receiving votes for the answers from a third user (“answer evaluation system” is third user, col. 1, ll. 61-65) for a predetermined voting period (“asker A determines if any more comments are needed to complete the answer” is the voting period, col. 3, ll. 40-45); and increasing polling score, using the processor (“via the computer network”, col. 2, l. 63), corresponding to the answers in response to the input of the votes. (“numerical score” is polling score, col. 3, ll. 34-36)

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose the limitations of claim 23. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that claim 23 is similar to claim 8. Accordingly, claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as set for in claim 8 and the examiner's response in the immediately previous paragraph. More specifically, Gardner et al discloses the limitations of claim 23 as follows. If the period has elapsed, receiving input for adopting the answer and evaluation data for the adopted answer from the first user (“question

asker A publishes a question and assigns question points” + “comments relevant to the question” is input for adopting the answer and evaluation data, col. 3, ll. 8-9 & 21-22); and increasing point data (“A may increase the number of pints assigned to a question”, col. 3, ll. 38-39), using the processor, associated with the second user (“answerers” is second user, col. 3, ll. 21-24) who input the adopted answer based on the evaluation data. (“answerers request and obtain clarifications ... before providing an answer”, col. 3, ll. 21-24).

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose the limitation (d) of claim 29. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that the prior and instant office actions disclose this limitation as copied below. Deciding using the processor (“via the computer network”, col. 2, l. 63) the question and an answer associated with the question as knowledge data. (“formal recognition” is knowledge data, col. 5, ll. 1-5)

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose providing the polling score on the web page in association with the answers. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that Gardner et al teach this limitation via displaying on a WWW page a question list with corresponding question point values. with corresponding question point values. (Fig. 2, col. 3, ll57-60)

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose an elapsed answer period – i.e., if in Figure 1, answer is complete at step 110, steps 112 and 114 continue the answer period. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that the answer period has truly elapsed at step 110- of Figure 1 because steps 112 and 114 are merely

administrative “clean up tasks” for implementation of the answerer motivation and incentive steps of the process. The answer is definitely over at step 110.

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gardner et al fails to disclose adopting an answer based on the numerical score assigned by the asker, A. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument and responds that (“if comments chosen in step 106 and evaluated in step 108 are sufficient to constitute a complete answer” (Fig. 1) is adopting an answer based on numerical score. (i.e., “quantitative evaluation”, Fig. 1 and col. 3, ll. 34-45)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM PORTER** whose telephone number is (571)270-7786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Thursday 8 - 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/W.P./

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623